



RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 2800

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor	: Kevin T. O'Dougherty	Group Art Unit: 2876 Examiner: Paik, Steven S.
Appln. No.	: 10/725,218	
Filed	: December 1, 2003	
Title	: MANUFACTURING SYSTEM WITH INTRINSICALLY SAFE ELECTRIC INFORMATION STORAGE	
Docket No.	: N95.12-0014 (ATMI-667)	

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SENT VIA EXPRESS MAIL

Express Mail No.: EV 760047450 US

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on May 26, 2006, in which claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Mathewes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,751,520); claims 2-11 and 38 were objected to as being allowable but dependent upon a rejected base claim; and claims 12-37 and 39-42 were allowed. Claims 1-42 are pending in the present application.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Mathewes et al. In order to reject a claim under § 102(e), the reference must teach each and every limitation of the claims. MPEP 2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Claim 1 requires "an intrinsic safety barrier ... to limit electrical energy passing to the communication device." In order to allow for the use of the storage device and the communication device in the hazard zone, consideration must be made for safety and protection against the possibility of ignition, since this electrical equipment could potentially cause ignition of

O.K. to enter. Sg. 8/6/06